

Indian Demonstrative Pronominal Bases – A Revision

Author(s): M. B. Emeneau

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1980), pp. 20-27

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

INDIAN DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOMINAL BASES--A REVISION

M. B. Emeneau

University of California, Berkeley

A volume of papers which is to be published in memory of the late Sudhibhushan Bhattacharya will contain my contribution entitled "Demonstrative pronominal bases in the Indian linguistic area". It is an attempt to deal with a feature of such bases which occurs in some languages of all three major families of the Indian sub-continent, Indo-Aryan (IA), Dravidian (Dr.), and Munda. The paper unfortunately, as soon as sent off, needed thorough revision, since the most important work on this topic for a Munda language, although published in 1972 by Zide, only came to my attention after my paper was written in January 1980. The present paper, then, presents the required revision.

The demonstrative bases of Dravidian have not been treated in searching detail in any of the major treatments of Dravidian comparative grammar. The accompanying table gives a summary of the bases in the various languages.

A series of three bases, *i 'proximate', *u 'intermediate', *a 'remote', is evidenced for PDr. in a number of languages, including some in all of the subgroups, either in full working order or with *u obsolescent.

Three of the Central Dravidian (CDr.) languages clearly have *e 'intermediate' in a series with *i 'proximate'. The 'remote' forms are *a in Pengo and Kui, with an 'even more remote' o in Kui. Two of the recordings of Kuwi have series beginning with i e; Schulze's continues with he hu, Israel's (1977) with u he hu; Fitzgerald's account has only i u a. These CDr. languages obviously are independent in detail by language and/or dialect. Their common 'intermediate' *e seems to be attested in Gondi also, certainly in the Sironcha dialect's form eke 'in that direction' (Voc. entry 328), and possibly in the forms with ē- for 'this man, these men' (Voc. entry 390).

Most puzzling in several of the CDr. and North Dravidian (NDr.) series are those items with initial h-. In two of the recordings of Kuwi, bases he- and hu- are recorded. Schulze's series is: i e he hu, he- meaning 'that at a greater distance (than e-)', hu- 'that at the greatest distance'. Israel's series is: i e u he hu, with increasing distance indicated by the successive items.

In Kurux one member of the series has initial h; the series is: i hu a. But intensive search in Grignard's grammar (Grignard 1924, pp. 108-109) has discovered several adverbs of place in which, without any meaning variation, there occur alternative forms with and without initial h-, viz. isan/hisan 'here', asan/hasan 'there', in series with husan 'there' (without a parallel *usan); iyyā/hiyyā 'in this place', ayyā/hayyā 'in that place' (but only huiyyā); ittrā/hittrā 'this side, in these parts', attrā/hattrā 'that side, in those parts' (but only huttrā).

Similar to these last items in Kurux are items in several of the CDr. languages, in which no difference of meaning is recorded as correlating with the presence or absence of h-.

Pengo has the series: i e a, but a few forms are recorded in the grammar (Burrow-Bhattacharya 1970, p. 7 and vocabulary) with base: he- and ha-; it is possible that they generate complete sets of forms and even that there are differences of meaning, but the grammar (p. 7) treats the occurrence of h- as something 'sporadic' or idiolectal.

The Gondi vocabulary of Burrow and Bhattacharya (*Voc.*) records a smattering of forms with h-. The Adilabad and Yeotmal dialects (i.e. in the west central area of Gondi) have several forms with h- based on i and a, viz. Yeotmal and also Adilabad as recorded by P. Setumadhava Rao id/hid 'this woman or thing', iv/hiv 'these women or things'; Adilabad ad/had 'that woman or thing', av/hav 'those women or things'. The Adilabad dialect as recorded by P. S. Subrahmanyam (1968) has several case and adverbial forms with h- (pp. 233-4), viz. handāl 'from that side', hāpē 'with that', hindāl 'from this side', hīkē 'here', hīpē 'with this'. The Mandla dialect (in the northern layer of dialects as recorded by Phailbus has hag(g)ā 'there' (in contrast with ag(g)ā of other dialects).

In Brahui the series is: dā ō ē. Bray's grammar (1909, p. 214) and his vocabulary record that in several adverbs and compounds ē is (as he puts it) 'not infrequently aspirated'. The items are: ēng/hēng 'that direction' and its case forms: ēngī/hēngī 'in or to that direction', ēngāi/hēngāi 'towards that direction', ēngān/hēngān 'from that direction'; ē-mōn/hē-mōn 'that side, the other side'; ē-pār/hē-pār 'that side, the far side'. This alternation, however, has nothing to do with the matter in hand. It forms part of the problem presented in general by Bray's writing of initial h, of which he says (p. 29): 'in ordinary conversation it is often hardly perceptible, and even dropped altogether'. Etymological study (Emeneau 1962, p. 62) has made it clear that Bray's h- is never represented by any phoneme in a PDr. form. In other words, it is, like the German glottal stop, merely the beginning of a vowel in initial position (and in hiatus). It has been reported also, but with no detail, that various dialects have h-, ʔ-, or zero in this position, and that contiguous dialects of Balochi show comparable alternation (Emeneau 1964, p. 75). Whatever the historical origin of this phenomenon, it is irrelevant in the present context.

These Dravidian data are restricted to some of the languages and even to some of the dialects in the central languages. The presence of h- is not restricted to any one of the demonstrative stems. In two dialects, or recordings, of Kuwi it is attended by meaning differentiation. In Kurux one of the bases always has h-, so that it is correlated with meaning. Otherwise, the presence of h- would seem to be a free variant of its absence--if, that is, we can trust our sources. Certainly it seems impossible to reconstruct anything for proto-Dravidian from the data at hand, or for proto-CDr., or even for proto-Kuwi.

A paper by De Vreese (1968) pointed out parallel phenomena in modern Indo-Aryan (NIA) and Munda, without mentioning the Dravidian phenomena. Some dialects of Maithili, Bhojpuri, Bengali, and the Bhatrī dialect of Oriya have demonstrative forms with initial h-; these languages belong to the Magadhi subgroup of NIA. De Vreese

collected these forms and compared with them many parallels in the northern Munda languages, Santali, Mundari, Ho, Korwa, Kharia, etc., notably the Santali series, which I discuss below.

Geographically, these NIA and Munda languages treated by De Vreese are in the same large area, i.e. the eastern end of the Ganges valley and the contiguous hilly areas to the south (i.e. the northern part of the Eastern Ghats and the Central Indian hills). Some of our Dravidian languages are in the same area, viz. Kuṛux, Kuwi, Pengo; Gondi is marginal to it. We would like to know whether there is contact within the area between speakers of the various languages and dialects of the three families. So far, however, it is impossible to establish this matter in any detail, or even in part to plot it roughly on a map. Occasional snippets of information do inform us that, e.g., the speakers of Pengo live in an area where Bhatras live, i.e. the speakers of the Bhatṛi dialect of Oriya already mentioned. Kurux speakers (Dravidian) and Mundari speakers (Munda) are co-inhabitants of Chota Nagpur. No information is at hand concerning contact of Kuwi speakers with speakers of Munda languages, even though collation of various maps seems to show that Kuwi is spoken in the same area as Juang or Bhumij.

This topic of geographical contiguity has been touched upon since De Vreese found that the convergence in the Magadhan NIA languages and the northern Munda languages is due to 'borrowings from Munda' in the NIA languages involved. His argument is based on the unconvincingness of suggested IA origins for the phenomena in these IA languages.

It would be well, before examining this areal hypothesis further, to look at the IA side in wider perspective. Outside this area there are parallel IA phenomena involving initial *h* in demonstratives. E.g. the Sindhi demonstratives have initial *h*- (*hi*-/*he*- *hu*-/*ho*- the Marathi proximate demonstrative has *h*- (sg. masc. *hā*, fem. *hē*, nt. *hē*). For the latter an IA explanation seems possible: **eṣakah* > *Apabhraṃśa* (Hemacandra) *ehau* > *hā* (Master 1964, p. 92). This probably gives warning that IA origin for the *h*- in the areal linguistic trait may have to be seriously considered.

Jules Bloch, moreover, collected numerous instances of *h*- in pronominal forms in IA, characterizing them as 'not justified by the etymology'. The forms listed (Bloch-Master 1965, p. 70) are, in the inscriptions of Aśoka: *hevaṃ* 'thus' (= *evaṃ*), *hemeva* 'just thus' (← Skt. *evam* *eva*), *hida* 'here' (= Skt. *iha*, Pali and Aśoka *iha*), *hedisa-* 'like this' (= *edisa-*, Pali *edisa-*), *hesā* 'this (fem.)' (= *eṣā*, Skt. *eṣā*). In addition, he lists Pali *hevaṃ* (= Aśokan *hevaṃ*), Marathi *hā* 'he', Sinhalese *hē* 'he', *hō* 'she' (beside *ē* and *ō*), and Bengali *hethā* 'here' (Pkt. *ettha*), *hothā* 'there'. Presumably this is where the Magadhan forms collected by De Vreese should be classed. Bloch's explanation was that *h*- was 'intended only to reinforce the expressiveness' of these words.

We find, then, rather numerous instances of demonstratives with initial *h*- in IA, from the Middle Indo-Aryan of Aśoka (3rd century B.C.) down to the present, in widely scattering geographic areas from the Indus Valley to Ceylon, but with a major concentration in

various dialects of the Magadhan area. Explanation in genetic IA terms has proved difficult, with rather divergent explanations given by various scholars. Contiguous with the Magadhan area of concentration are occurrences of forms with h- in several of the Dravidian languages, again with several other languages outside this area showing similar phenomena, and again with no explanation appearing in genetic Dravidian terms. Finally, as De Vreese pointed out, the northern Munda languages i.e. those contiguous with the IA and Dr. languages in the area of concentration, also have demonstratives with h-. He, noting the difficulty of explaining the IA forms historically, took the phenomenon to be explicable in terms of linguistic area diffusion and plumped for Munda as the source.

Since De Vreese wrote, Zide (1972, pp. 267-74), in a paper entitled "A Munda demonstrative system: Santali", has provided a deep analysis of the Santali system as presented by P. O. Boddling in 1929. The system, as characterized by Zide, has 159 forms. The deep analysis presents three demonstrative roots: o- 'this', i- 'that', a- 'yonder', each of which occurs with one of three pre-demonstrative qualifiers: n- 'near', Ø- 'unmarked', h- 'far'. There are then basically 'nine degrees of relative distance'. Other specifications occur, with which we shall not be concerned further: lateral, i.e. to the side, with infix -Vh-, vs. non-lateral unmarked, intensification ('this very', infix -VK+), sensory modality (-nɛ- 'visual' vs. -tɛ- 'non-visual, e.g. aural'), number, and gender (animate vs. inanimate). Zide states that these combinations, with one or two constraints, yield a total of 159 forms, and demonstrates that the deep-lying construct yields actually-spoken, surface forms by a complex set of rules. The forms show initially, with increasing distance, the initials: nu-/no- u-/o- hu-/ho- ni-/nɛ- i-/ɛ- hi-/hɛ- na- (not in Zide's tables, but quoted, p. 271, from Boddling as a variant) a- ha-.

Zide (p. 272) says that only Santali and Mundari-Ho (the Kherwarian sub-branch) have these 3 X 3 combinations of qualifiers and roots. The other northern Munda languages have a scattering of h- and n- forms, and 'the general scheme ... fits the data in the other languages fairly well'. Zide promises comparative treatment elsewhere but, so far as I know, we do not yet have it.

Detailed comparison between Santali-Mundari and the Dravidian data in terms of possible borrowing from the complex, but well-organized system on the Munda side into the less well-organized systems of the Dravidian languages, requires attention to the geographical contingencies.

Kurux, contiguous with Mundari, has in its series (i hu a) t 'intermediate' base hu, which is explicitly said to mean 'intermediate between near and far, or close to the person addressed'. This agrees well enough with Santali-Mundari hu-/ho-, which indicates the farthest distance within the proximate zone, and we might think of straightforward borrowing of the item, since Kurux is unique in having this item in this place in the series. The adverbial items of Kurux in which hi- alternates with i- 'here' and ha- with a- 'there', might show borrowing of ha- from Mundari ha- which indicates the most remote

distance; but hi- 'here' cannot be borrowed from Mundari hi- which indicates the most remote point in the intermediate zone.

The Kuwi items look prima facie like borrowing from Munda, with their longish series showing increasing distance. Unfortunately, the order is wrong. Both Schulze's and Israel's series have he- hu-, whereas the Santali series has the reverse order: ... hu-/ho- ... hi-/hẽ - ..., hu- being farthest in the proximate zone, while Kuwi's hu- is most remote in the whole series. We do not yet know the semantic characteristics of this trait in the Munda language or languages with which Kuwi might be or have been in contact, but unless it should turn out that such language has a very different system from that of Santali-Mundari, the use of the Santali system to establish borrowing by Kuwi has little to be said for it.

To attempt to save the hypothesis of areal diffusion we might think of borrowing of merely initial h- as a marker of the more remote. This would explain Kuwi very nicely, and would do well enough for Kurux hu-, as based on the Dr. intermediate u-, if we are not to take hu- as a straightforward borrowing. Again unfortunately, the accounts for the other Dravidian languages--Pengo and Gondi are involved--have h- alternating with absence of h- without difference of meaning (if the accounts are to be trusted).

On the IA side, the Magadhan accounts show (in De Vreese's account) in Maithili and Bhojpuri what seems to be free variation between forms with and without h-. They have bases, in Maithili i/e- ~ hi-/he- 'this' and o/u- ~ hu- 'that'; in Bhojpuri i- ~ hi- 'this' and u- ~ hu- 'that'. This reverses what is found in Santali, and agrees in general more with the Kuwi data, though even there the meanings of the demonstratives with front vowels do not agree very closely. The other IA languages cited earlier have h- either as obligatory initials of morphemes (as in Sindhi and Marathi) or as variations (as in Sinhalese).

Explanation in terms of borrowing of morphemes then has come to very little, since the semantics in almost all instances seems to have gone wrong. Could we speculate in another direction?

Earlier I quoted Bloch as finding the initial h- of IA to be 'expressive'. This may be promising, but considerable restatement is required.

It has been noted often enough about demonstratives that 'deviations from the phonetic pattern sometimes occurs in deictic words'; I am quoting Bloomfield (1933, p. 147), who gives as examples that in English initial [ɛ] occurs only in the series they, this, that, the, then, there, etc., and that in Russian the phoneme [e] occurs initially only in demonstrative words (e.g. [e'to] 'this'). In Vietnamese, in roughly the same class of words a departure from normal phonology is seen, in that difference of tone alone distinguishes 'proximate' and 'remote'; e.g. đây 'here' vs. đây 'there' (Emeneau 1951, p. 136; Thompson 1965, p. 142); Thompson analyses these words into smaller significant elements, a procedure which is not possible for most of the lexicon (except for 'expressive' derivatives). The point at issue is that in these demonstratives there is a departure from the normal monolithic phonological independence of words. Is it possible

that we have here an approach to a 'universal' tendency, that there is a greater probability that demonstratives (in the broadest sense) will show divergences from the phonological norm of the language, than will other elements in the language--a tendency that they share with 'expressives'? And as a corollary of this, there is a greater probability that they will in their historical development show phonological divergences from the norm. The latter is seen e.g. in the syllabic losses in the historical development of French demonstratives. Another example is shown by the demonstratives' departure from the 'apical displacement' rule of development in the CDr. languages (e.g. *iraṇṭ- 'two' : Telugu reṇḍu, Gondi re/and, Pengo rinḍ-); the demonstratives have displacement, even though the consonant involved is not apical, but v or d (e.g. Telugu vāḍu 'that man' : Tamil avan; Telugu adi, oblique stem dāni- 'that woman or thing' : Tamil atu).

I would suggest then that the initial h- in demonstratives in some of the CDr. languages is an instance of this tendency. The point will not be a descriptive one, since h- otherwise occurs from various sources in these languages, but a historical one, since no reconstruction of a PDr. h- is possible for the demonstratives, nor is h one of the PDr. phonemes. It might be possible to posit a reconstructed h- in demonstratives for a group of CDr. languages. How to go further remains at this point an unsolved problem. If for the IA languages from Aśoka down, h- is unexplained in genetic terms, or only with great difficulty, even with improbability, so explained, are all the IA forms instances of a common tendency in demonstratives? We do not yet know for Munda much beyond the analysis of Santali-Mundari; very specifically, we do not know whether this one Munda system is something explicable from Austroasiatic, or whether it is an innovation. Putting all together, we would be tempted to find an areal trait. But does it have its origin simply in one of the language families, e.g. Munda? Or, if it is a universal of the linguistic area, seen from Aśoka to the present, and from Sind to Bengal and Ceylon, what are the specifics of its origination temporally and locally?

If this is as far as we can carry the research, we have achieved a piece of typology. To identify it as a 'universal' as exemplified in this area, gives it a name. It still leaves the historical question wide open, and that I must own we have not been able to push very far--we have only suggested several points at which further research might be able to find the direction of diffusion. This is perhaps disappointing, but it is typical of the difficulties of areal linguistics.

The earlier paper of which this is a revision went on to investigate in detail some of the CDr. series of stems. This need not be repeated here. However, my last words on the aberrant Brahui series dā ṁ ē may be summarized. The first two items, dā 'this' and ṁ 'intermediate', are now clearly to be regarded as borrowings, dā from Pashto, ṁ from Persian (in the archaic pronunciation found in Afghanistan-Baluchistan-India) or from IA Lahnda-Panjabi. The last item, ē 'remote', is to be linked with CDr., i.e. Kui-Kuwi, Pengo, and even Gondi, *e.

Another item, so far not brought into the picture at all, is a Malto item, which has in my earlier researches led me astray. This language has a series i u a. In addition, beside a there occurs na, which means usually 'that one [remote] who is present'. Not only are we forcibly reminded of the Santali qualifier n- 'near (within the zone of the demonstrative to which it is prefixed)', but Santali has na- for 'near within the remote zone'. The whole morph is undoubtedly a borrowing from Santali into Malto (the languages are contiguous

Konḍa has four derivative bases from demonstrative stems with ni- and na- instead of i- and a- which are to be expected both within the Konḍa system and etymologically. They are: nini- 'this type or manner', nani- 'that sort of', niso- 'this much/many', naso- 'that much/many'. No explanation for this n- is at hand within Dravidian. This language is spoken in Koraput district of Andhra Pradesh. Neighboring Munda languages (Sora, Gutob-Remo) may have some parallel phenomena, but analysis is not yet available. Zide (p. 272) has promised analysis for other Munda languages and comparative statement; when we have this, much more clarity is probable for the phenomena with which we are concerned.

Table

i	u	a	OTa. Ka. Kuwi (F.); (with u obsolescent) Ma. Konḍa Malto		
<u>i</u> u		a	Ko. Tu. Pa.		
i		a	Ta. To. Koḍ. Te. Kol.-Nk. Ga.		
i	hu	a	Kurux		
i	e/he	a	Pengo		
<u>i</u> e		a	Gondi		
i	e	a	o	Kui	
i	e	he	hu	Kuwi (S.)	
i	e	u	he	hu	Kuwi (Israel)
dā	ō	ē	Brahui		

Dravidian demonstrative bases
(from proximate to remote)

References

(For some of the Dravidian source bibliography, see
Burrow-Emeneau, A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary.)

- Bloch-Master 1965 = Jules Bloch, Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times, English edition largely revised by the author and translated by Alfred Master (Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1965).
- Bloomfield 1933 = Leonard Bloomfield, Language (New York, Holt, 1933)
- Bodding 1929 = P. O. Bodding, Materials for a Santali Grammar II, mostly morphological (Dumka, 1929).
- Bray 1909 = Denys De S. Bray, The Brahui Language, Part I (Calcutta, Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1909).
- 1909 = Sir Denys Bray, The Brāhūī Language, Parts II and III (Delhi, Manager of Publications, 1934).
- Burrow-Bhattacharya 1970 = T. Burrow and S. Bhattacharya, The Pengo Language (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970).
- De Vreese 1968 = K. De Vreese, "Munda pronouns in New Indo-Aryan", Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday (The Hague, Mouton, 1968), pp. 359-61.
- Emeneau 1951 = M. B. Emeneau, Studies in Vietnamese (Annamese) Grammar (University of California Publications in Linguistics 8; Berkeley, University of California Press, 1951).
- 1962 = M. B. Emeneau, "New Brahui etymologies", Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown (American Oriental Series 47; New Haven, Conn., American Oriental Society, 1962), pp. 59-69.
- 1964 = M. B. Emeneau, "Linguistic desiderata in Baluchistan", Indo-Iranica ... présentés à Georg Morgenstierne ... (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1964), pp. 73-7.
- Grignard 1924 = A. Grignard, A Grammar of the Oraon Language (Calcutta, Catholic Orphan Press, 1924).
- Israel 1977 = M. Israel, "Demonstratives in Kūbi, Kū'i and Kūvi", IJDL, International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics 6.223-32 (1977).
- Master 1964 = Alfred Master, A Grammar of Old Marathi (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964).
- Subrahmanyam 1968 = P. S. Subrahmanyam, A Descriptive Grammar of Gondi (Annamalai University, Department of Linguistics Publication 16, 1968).
- Thompson 1965 = Laurence C. Thompson, A Vietnamese Grammar (Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1965).
- Voc. = T. Burrow and S. Bhattacharya, "A comparative vocabulary of the Gondi dialects", Journal of the Asiatic Society 2.73-251 (1960).
- Zide 1972 = Norman H. Zide, "A Munda demonstrative system: Santali", Langues et techniques: nature et société, t. 1 Approche linguistique (Paris, Éditions Klincksieck, 1972; Haudricourt volume), pp. 267-74.